



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

fw

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| 10/658,174 | 09/08/2003 | Evan Cho | JCLA10514 | 3340 |
| 23900 | 7590 | 11/29/2006 | EXAMINER | |
| J C PATENTS, INC. 4 VENTURE, SUITE 250 IRVINE, CA 92618 | | | | SHERMAN, STEPHEN G |
| ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| 2629 | | | | DATE MAILED: 11/29/2006 |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/658,174 | CHO ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Stephen G. Sherman | 2629 | |

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 10 November 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a) The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.
 Claim(s) objected to: _____.
 Claim(s) rejected: _____.
 Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
 13. Other: _____.

AMR A. AWAD
SUPERVISORY ENT. EXAMINER



Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant argues similarly to the arguments submitted previously, which are addressed in the Final Rejection, in that: 1.) "the Scheffer reference is not reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which Applicant's was concerned." 2.) "the Scheffer reference still fails to teach or suggest the feature of "finding a first voltage, a second voltage, a first voltage maintenance period and a second voltage maintenance period according to the initial voltage and the final voltage" as claimed in claim 1." 3.) "the proposed modification in the Office action has basically destroyed the principle operation of the Koshoubo." The examiner disagrees with all of the applicant's arguments. First of all, with respect to the applicant's argument that the Scheffer reference is not pertinent to the problem solved, the examiner again makes it clear that the CLAIMED invention only states of applying voltages to a TRANSMISSION LINE. The examiner could find any reference, regardless of being in the display field, that teaches of applying voltages to any kind of transmission line and apply it as teaching the claimed invention regardless of the reference being pertinent to the particular problem. Nevertheless, the examiner used two references within the field of displays, which are in the field of the applicant's endeavor, therefore the references DO NOT NEED TO SOLVE THE SAME PROBLEM because as stated in the MPEP 2141.01(a): "the reference must EITHER be in the FIELD OF APPLICANT'S ENDEAVOR OR, if not, THEN be reasonable pertinent to the particular problem with which the inventor was concerned. With respect to the applicant's second argument that "the final voltage could be possibly found according to above-mentioned values, while those values could not be found according to the final voltage to which they correspond," the examiner asserts that in Scheffer the final voltage desired IS KNOWN, and that the amount of time with which the voltages of S+D and S-D are applied determines the final voltage, therefore, for example if the final value that is to be attained is .5 and the voltage level of S+D=1 and S-D=0, then if for half of the time S+D is applied and half of the time S-D is applied then the final value will be .5, meaning that the process does work both ways where the final voltage is used to determine the length of time the voltages are applied and the voltages applied also determine the final voltage. With respect to the third argument, when the applicant states that the principle operation has been destroyed, the applicant attacks each of the references INDIVIUALLY and paid no attention to HOW the references are combined. Both references teach of applying voltages to flat panel displays, and the examiner only used what the Scheffer reference is teaching to be applied to the Koshoubo reference. As stated previously, when combined, the selection period taught by Koshoubo may be made to stay the same while the periods with which the two pulses are applied can be made to change within the selection period by using the teaching of Scheffer, therefore allowing the device to maintain its principle operation.